



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/932,213	08/17/2001	William Webb	25216-0863	5012
30554	7590	10/13/2005	EXAMINER	
SHEMWELL MAHAMEDI LLP 4880 STEVENS CREEK BOULEVARD SUITE 201 SAN JOSE, CA 95129			CHANG, KENT WU	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2675	

DATE MAILED: 10/13/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/932,213	Applicant(s) WEBB ET AL.	
	Examiner Kent Chang	Art Unit 2675	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 July 2005.
 2a) ☒ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-50 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-50 is/are rejected.
 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
 1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
 * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

3. Claims 1-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Boesen (US Patent No. 5,542,721).

Boesen discloses a mobile device having a first segment; a second segment with a first input feature (keypad section 22) moveably coupled to the first segment to move between a contracted position and an extended position along one axis; a display assembly provided by the first segment, wherein the portion of the display assembly is accessible to contact by a user when the second segment is in the extended position; wherein the second segment overlays the first segment when the second segment is in the contracted position so as to reduce a length of the mobile device as recited in claims

Art Unit: 2675

1, 19-21, 27-29, 41, 45-50 (see column 5 lines 23-40 and Figure 7). Obviously, the portion of the first segment being overlaid by the second segment could have varied from none to full length dependent on user's choice, a longer overlaid portion would have lead to a smaller size of the device, while a shorter overlaid portion would have provided more input functions to the user. Furthermore, Boesen includes a pivotable mechanism to allow the user to adjust the angle between the first segment and second segment. However, this function is only for enabling the user to use the device in a manner as a phone handset, and the pivoting operation is performed after the sliding operation, wherein the pivotable mechanism is operative independently from the operation of the sliding operation. It would have been obvious for one ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to eliminate such a pivotable mechanism in the device of Boesen so as to provide a device with less parts and a simple operation. Omission of element and its function in combination is obvious expedient if remaining elements perform same functions as before. In re KARLSON (CCPA) 136 USPQ 184 (1963).

Consider claims 2 and 23. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to replace the touch screen 38 with a small touch screen and a touch pad so as reduce manufacturing cost of the device. However, such a modification would have resulted to a touch screen with a small size.

Consider claims 3 and 22. The device of Boesen includes character recognition (column 4 lines 53-57).

Consider claim 4. The second segment in the device of Boesen includes a plurality of buttons (22) overlaying the portion of the display assembly.

Consider claims 5-7. Boesen further teaches to provide additional function buttons or other inputs (column 3 lines 51-55). Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Boesen's device to include other known input functions such as multi-directional member, touch pad as suggested by Boesen so as to provide the user additional input functions.

The device of Boesen includes a front shell (portion of 4), a midframe (portion of 38), a bottom shell (portion of 24), a first rail and a second rail, a first connecting member and a second connecting member to enable the second segment slide to the first segment (see figures 6 and 7). It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to housing the rails and connecting members in two side surface, the back surface, or other places of the mobile device since the device would function equally well with the rails and connecting members locating in any places (as recited in claims 8-18, 24-26, 30-37, 40). Furthermore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use additional rails (as recited in claim 38-39) in the device of Boesen so as to enable easy moving of the two segments.

Consider claims 41, 42. Boesen discloses a mobile device having a first segment with a first input feature (the touch panel section 38), a second segment with a second input feature (keypad section 22) moveably coupled to the first segment to move between a contracted position and an extended position along one axis; a display

Art Unit: 2675

assembly provided by the first segment', wherein the second segment overlays a portion of the first segment when the second segment is in the contracted position so as to reduce a length of the mobile device (see column 5 lines 23-40 and Figure 7).

Furthermore, Boesen includes a pivotable mechanism to allow the user to adjust the angle between the first segment and second segment. However, this function is only for enabling the user to use the device in a manner as a phone handset, and the pivoting operation is performed after the sliding operation, wherein the pivotable mechanism is operative independently from the operation of the sliding operation. It would have been obvious for one ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to eliminate such a pivotable mechanism in the device of Boesen so as to provide a device with less parts and a simple operation. Omission of element and its function in combination is obvious expedient if remaining elements perform same functions as before. In re KARLSON (CCPA) 136 USPQ 184 (1963).

Consider claim 43. The second segment has a plurality of buttons (22).

Consider claim 44. In one of the embodiment (as shown in Fig.8), Boesen further teaches that the first segment having a reduced section (28) that has a lesser thickness than the remainder of the first portion (24) so as to allow a portion of the first segment being easily accessible from the same surface level as the second surface level while in the contacted position, but still having the advantage of a reduce the length of the mobile device. Obviously, the portion of the first segment being overlaid by the second segment could have varied from none to full length dependent on user's choice, a

longer overlaid portion would have lead to a smaller size of the device, while a shorter overlaid portion would have provided more input functions to the user.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed 7/11/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

As to applicant's arguments with respect to the limitation of the use of a pivotable, note that Boesen includes a pivotable mechanism to allow the user to adjust the angle between the first segment and second segment. However, this function is **only for enabling the user to use the device in a manner as a phone handset, and the pivoting operation is performed after the sliding operation, wherein the pivotable mechanism is operative independently from the operation of the sliding operation.** It would have been obvious for one ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to eliminate such a pivotable mechanism in the device of Boesen so as to provide a device with less parts and a simple operation. Omission of element and its function in combination is obvious expedient if remaining elements perform same functions as before. In re KARLSON (CCPA) 136 USPQ 184 (1963).

As to applicant's arguments regarding the rejection of claim10, note that the device of Boesen has a midframe (28 and 38) including the entire layer from the top surface of a display to the bottom surface of the case.

The remainder of the pertinent topics for argument are present in the appropriate rejections above.

Conclusion

5. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

CONTACT INFORMATION

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kent Chang whose telephone number is 571-272-7667. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Thursday from 9:00 AM to 6:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sumati Lefkowitz, can be reached at 571-272-3638.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

571-273-8300

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to the Customer Service Window, now located at the Randolph Building, 401 Dulany Street, Alexandria, VA 22314.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Kent Chang
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2675

kc

10/10/05